



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Wesley R. Bussman et al.)
Serial No.: 10/758,642) Art Unit: 3749
Filing Date: January 15, 2004)
For: REMOTE STAGED RADIANT WALL) Examiner: Stephen Gravini
FURNACE BURNER CONFIGURATIONS)
AND METHODS)

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION

The Office Action mailed on February 16, 2005 (the "Office Action") and the references relied upon by the Examiner have been carefully reviewed. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the Remarks as follows.

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that "claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Lifshits (US 6,062,848)." In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Knight (US 5,718,573). Claims 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lifshits in view of Wang et al. (US 2003/0170579). Claims 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lifshits in view of Johnson (US 5,688,115). Claims 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight in view of Wang. Claims 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight in view of Johnson. The Examiner also rejected all of the pending claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of co-pending Application No. 10/807,927.